REMARKS

New Claim

New claim 119 is supported by, *inter alia*, Table C and paragraph [0091].

Specification

The Examiner objected to the Applicants use of the term "catalyst mix" as confusing and improper. Applicants have amended paragraphs [00324], [00327], [00330], and [00331] to remove reference to catalyst mix. Applicants believe this amendment obviates the Examiner's objection. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of these amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4 over U.S. Patent No. 6,800,700 to *Sun* ("the *Sun* patent". Upon further examination of the *Sun* file wrapper, Applicants believe that the priority date of the instant claims predates the portions of the *Sun* patent that the Examiner deems relevant.

The instant application has a filing date of October 15, 2003 and claims priority to provisional U.S. Application No. 60/418,482 (filed October 15, 2002).

The *Sun* patent has a filing date of December 19, 2002, over two months <u>after</u> the priority date of the instant application. The *Sun* patent claims priority to U.S. Application Serial No. 09/860,051 which was filed on May 17, 2001 and which published as U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0047064 ("the *Sun* priority application") (cited in an IDS filed herewith). However, the *Sun* priority application does not fully support the broad disclosure of the *Sun* patent. Particularly, the *Sun* priority application clearly is directed to (and only discloses) "high molecular weight" polymers. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ [0006] ("high molecular weight"), [0008] ("high molecular weight"), [0010] ("high molecular weight"), [0011] ("molecular weight in the range of 100,000 and 800,000"), and claims 1 ("molecular weight in the range of between 100,000 and 800,000") and claim 16 ("molecular weight in the range of 100,000 and 800,000"). It does not mention or hint at low molecular weight (*i.e.*, below 100,000) as claimed in the instant application. Thus, to the extent the *Sun* patent may disclose low molecular weight polymers, it is entitled only to its own filing date of December 19, 2002 and is not prior art to the instant claims.

Additionally, it would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art reading the *Sun* patent that it is directed to a linear material, not the branched material as claimed (and indicated by the g' limitation in the claims). Particularly, the *Sun* patent is directed to a "sticky" and "tenacious" polymer that is "difficult to manufacture and process in conventional polyolefin manufacturing processes . . . ." *See, e.g.*, Abstract and col. 1, ll. 17-28.

As defined in the instant application in paragraph [00290], the g' is the ratio of the intrinsic viscosity of the branched polymer to the intrinsic viscosity of the linear polymer having the same viscosity averaged molecular weight. Viscosity (and thus g') decreases as branchiness increases. Thus, the viscous and "tenacious" polymers of the *Sun* patent would be known by one of ordinary skill in the art to be highly linear, high g' material, not the branched low g' as claimed.

Applicants' representative looks forward to discussing these issues with the Examiner during the interview scheduled for December 13, 2005.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that it will assist her review, she is invited and encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at her convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

December 5, 2005
Date

Jeremy P. Welch
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 52,348

ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-2429
Fax: 281-834-2495